

### **REMARKS**

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed January 16, 2009. Prior to the Office Action mailed January 16, 2009, Claims 1-50 were pending in the Application. The present Response amends Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 13, 16-18; cancels Claims 2, 6, 15, 19, and 26-50 and add new Claims 51-54, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 3-5, 7-14, 16-18, 20-25, 51-54. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action mailed January 16, 2009, Claim 1-2, 7-15, 20-27, 32-39, 44-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033535.

In the Office Action mailed January 16, 2009, Claim 5, 18, 30, 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033535, in view of TheServerSide.com article "BEA announces BEA Tuxedo 8.0 and Bea Weblogic Enterprise 6.0" on June 12, 2001.

In the Office Action mailed January 16, 2009, Claim 6, 19, 31 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033535, in view of Zois.co.uk's Technical note "Using Tuxedo Asynchronously with Global Transaction" published April 23, 2001.

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1, as previously amended, defines the feature of "*wherein the first type server holds only access control list and relies on one of the plurality of second type servers to provide user and group information.*"

Examiner admits that Fisher does not explicitly teach the first type server holds Access control list.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fisher and other cited prior arts do not teach holding system-specific information, such as Access Control List information, in the first type server, while relying on the second type of server for general user and group security information.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 13**

Claims 13, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 1 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 3-5, 7-12, 14, 16-18, 20-25, and 51-54**

Claims 2-12, 14-25, 27-37 and 39-49 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

### **Claim 10**

Claim 10 further defines the feature of *"a user information cache that caches a copy of said user authentication information in case of a failure in a communication link between the first type server and the second type of server."*

Fisher uses a cache between the authentication system and an application, instead of a cache within the authentication system, between two different type of servers, as embodied in Claim 10.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fisher and other cited arts do not teach this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 10, as submitted, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Applicant believes that no fee is due with this communication. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 11, 2009

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/

Kuiran (Ted) Liu  
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800